



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

note of explanation is at least demanded. But Mr. Hamilton's omissions are not even open to this allowance and correction, and where palpable mistakes occur so frequently, doubt is cast upon the integrity of the whole text. Even bad writing and poor spelling will not account for such changes in names as are to be found in this volume. It was Adam Stephen, not Stephens, though Mr. Hamilton uses the latter in many notes and even in the table of contents. Why should "Levern and Stuart" (p. 247) become "Savern and Stuart" on p. 280; and "Fortin and Wing" (p. 182) be changed to "Fortin and Winey" on p. 192? Fairfax was a good writer, yet he is made to speak (p. 101) of the "London Flat" where "Fleet" is evidently the proper word. So *Spotward* (p. 87) is probably *Spotswood*; *St. Maloa* (p. 18) is correctly printed *St. Maloes* on p. 60; and *Oy^{rs}* (p. 170) should be *Off^{rs}*. These are but examples. Then did not Bouquet write of "entrenched camps" (p. 129) and not *extreme* camps, as Washington's reply uses the former term? Who was the *Gen.* Braxton mentioned on p. 187? Was it not *Geo.* Braxton? The William Gachen who wrote the letters on p. 267 was McGachen, and the Botomworth error for Bosomworth is repeated. The well-known *Colden* is printed *Colder* on p. 338, and the "&c^a" on p. 173 does not convey any meaning until made into "& I." Such carelessness is exasperating as it throws upon the reader the difficult task of testing the accuracy of the reading, and the frequency of error is a serious blot upon a very creditable undertaking.

WORTHINGTON CHAUNCEY FORD.

Documentary History of the Struggle for Religious Liberty in Virginia. By CHARLES F. JAMES, D.D. (Lynchburg: J. P. Bell Company. 1900. Pp. 272.)

UP to 1699 there was no religious toleration in Virginia. The English Parliament had, indeed, passed the Act of Toleration in 1689, but ten years elapsed before it went into operation in Virginia. After a period of quiet, persecutions began in 1768, and with them began the struggle for religious liberty, in which a complete victory was not secured till 1802. It is this period of struggle, 1768-1802, that is covered by Dr. James's volume; he has brought together in convenient form the principal documents bearing on the movement, from the journal of the Virginia assembly, the resolutions and petitions of various religious bodies, and letters and other writings of Madison, Jefferson and other statesmen of the time, appending comments on the documents. Thus the book is not a connected history of the movement, but it gives the materials from which the reader may form his own judgment. The several stadia of the struggle and the attitudes of the principal religious bodies of the state are set forth clearly. Naturally the Episcopalians, being the Established Church, were opposed to any change in the existing order. The Presbyterians also, affected by the traditions of the Church of Scotland, showed at moments an inclination

to favor the retention of some features of an establishment; in 1784 they favored a general assessment for the support of religion, but they withdrew from this position the next year, and in general were friends of liberty. The Methodists, who had as yet hardly separated formally from the Church of England, took no definite part in the contest. The Baptists were in the best position, by their history and their beliefs, to oppose all restrictions of the exercise of religion: they were the most radical of dissenters, and they had never had, as a body, any connection with the state. At the outset of the war they warmly espoused the side of the colonies, and thus found themselves in position to secure an extension of privileges; their petition to the Convention of 1775, that their ministers should be allowed to preach to their soldiers in camp, was granted. There has been a good deal of controversy on the question whether the Baptists or the Presbyterians took the lead in the demand for religious liberty in Virginia; the facts in the case are presented at length and in a spirit of fairness in this volume. It is asserted by Baptist historians that as early as 1775 the Baptists resolved to petition the convention for the abolition of the ecclesiastical establishment; but it does not appear that the petition was ever sent up. On this and similar points, such as the revision of the marriage-laws and the abolition of glebes, Dr. James is full and precise, and his volume will be found useful by all students of history.

C. H. TOY.

The History of South Carolina in the Revolution, 1775-1780. By EDWARD MCCRADY, LL.D. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1901. Pp. 899.)

THE volume of Mr. McCrady's narrative broadens and strengthens as he progresses. This, the third installment of his work, fully justifies its claim to the leading position among our state histories. More than 850 pages are here devoted to the history of the Revolution in South Carolina from its beginning to the close of 1780. Another volume will be required to trace the history of the Revolution to its close. If he continues on this scale through the first half of the nineteenth century, he will have produced one of the most elaborate of existing treatises on American history. When this and other works on South Carolina already in preparation shall be completed and published, we may suppose that the political history of that commonwealth will have been more thoroughly explored than that of any other.

As in the period of royal government, so here Mr. McCrady finds no competitor of importance of later date than Ramsay's *Revolution in South Carolina*. The *Memoirs* of Drayton, Moultrie, Lee, Tarleton; Draper's elaborate study of the battle of King's Mountain, and the biographies of the commanders engaged in the conflict illustrate each its phase of the subject. But none of these is more than a special study or a contribution of original material. These, with other studies like them, are the sources